RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER 2001

AUG 2 1 2005

5712738300 PTO/SB/21 (09-04) Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of Information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. Application Number 09/826.355 Filing Date TRANSMITTAL April 5, 2001 First Named Inventor Dekang Lin FORM Art Unit 2644 **Examiner Name** Shortledge T. (to be used for all correspondence after initial filling) Attorney Docket Number Total Number of Pages in This Submission **ENCLOSURES** (Check all that apply) After Allowance Communication to TC Drawing(s) Fee Transmittal Form Appeal Communication to Board Licensing-related Papers of Appeals and Interferences Fee Attached Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) ✓ Petition Amendment/Reply Petition to Convert to a Proprietary Information Provisional Application After Final Power of Attorney, Revocation Status Letter Change of Correspondence Address Affidavits/declaration(s) Other Enclosure(s) (please identify Terminal Disclaimer below): Extension of Time Request Request for Refund Express Abandonment Request CD, Number of CD(s) Information Disclosure Statement Landscape Table on CD Remarks Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm Name **CUSTOMER NUMBER 020212** Signature l-e Printed name ANTHONY R. LAMBERT Reg. No. 32.813 Date August 21, 2005 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below: Signature ANTHONY R. LAMBERT, REG. NO. 32,813, CUST. NO. 020212 Date August 21, 2005 Typed or printed name

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 2 1 2005

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Assistant Commissioner for Patents Alexandria, Virginia U.S.A.

Re:

Application Serial No. 09/826,355

Applicant: Dekang Lin and Patrick Pantel.

Title: Discovery of Inference Rules from Text

Art unit: 2644

Examiner: Shortledge, T.

Filed: April 5, 2001

This is in response to the official action dated July 1, 2005.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The applicant notes that the examiner's official action fails to indicate why the examiner considers applicant's arguments for patentability of claim 1 to be unpersuasive. However, it is noted that the rejection based on anticipation by Zadrozny et al has not been repeated.

Claims 1 -19 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zadrozny et al in view of Fraser et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Zadrozny et al. and Fraser et al. cannot be combined as references, and in any event cannot yield the invention as claimed in claim 1.

The examiner has apparently simply noted that Fraser et al uses the term "inference rule" but it is not at all clear that the examiner has checked what is meant in Fraser et al by "inference rule". The inference rule in Fraser et al. states that (p.138) "If A isa B, the for any true proposition P that refers to B, it is possible to infer another true proposition Q that is the same as P except that A is substituted in Q for B in P." In order for this rule to apply, there must be an 'isa' relation